Dear Howard, 9/27/77

Your two 3cl mailings came yesterday. I've gone over all but the official records and your FOIA letters. I write because they'll now have to await my return from a trip. If you have any specific questions please write them. I presume from their absence you do not.

On the memo of transfer I'n not certain now whether my first request was written or verbal. I can tell you when it was: the first working day after the Friday of the first hearing in Halleck's court. I can date it another way: immediately before the beginning of the empaneling of the Shaw jury, which was either 1/20 or 1/21, the way Garrison figured omens in terms of the new administration. it was from New Orleans. I think it more likely that I phoned Marion Johnson. However, you'll find references to my prior requests and to my raising the question with Rhoads at the second Halleck hearing.

I'm leaving Thursday morning for a Friday afternoon speech at a small college about 30 miles from Madison,Wisc. Friday I rush to connect with a Chicago plane, then to LA. I'd expected to go to Seattle first to see Perry, who seems willing to give me an affidavit for C.A.75-226. He is to be away so I'm going to L.A. from Chicago thence to Seattle, where I'll not be leaving the airport area. Perry is to meet me there Thursday evening. I'll be on a morning plane back to Washington. The motel is at the airport.

Tomorrow I have a blood test, the motel reservation to pick up, ldl to take grocery shopping and other matters so I'll probably not have time for those records.

While rain today and some tiredness cut down on the time away from the desk I spend a fair amount in the lane, walking back and forth, sometimes listening to the news, sometimes to tapes. This is necessary but it cuts down on the output. Lately that has meant much time on FBI records and too much making a record of what addresses compliance, meaning non-compliance. It is just too vast to hope to encompass or control.But in the end it willbe fine and we've so much non-compliance it is not necessary to document all. And with all a new and different non-King FBI story is emerging, much more significant than its spooking of King, which is dramatic and captivating but not nearly as serious.

In speaking to Perry I will not be having a structure interview. I'll take my notes of my second interview with me and will read them just before we meet. What I think may be my major interest will be his part in the Connally surgery and that bigs secret, that he was a consultant on the thigh wound. It has great relevance to the 226 case, the purpose of all this. Front neck, of course. If he'll say there was bruising there that will help. But I'm not trying to pull anything on him. We'll talk and I'll send him the typed affidavit subject to any changes he may want to make in it. He and Carrico have talked. They seemed to think I wanted them to say something new. Carrico is going to be away a few days. Perry is this weekend, hence the change to LA first. I think Carrico will be willing to do it by mail after I speak to Perry. But we'll see. Now if you have any suggestions you'll be able to reach me c/o Paul Wuttzel, 1699 Sunset Plaza Drive, LA 90069. Maybe the internal bruising, too, and what it means. He was indignant over that - and should have been. I've sent him either all of the panel report or those pages.

Of course everyone cares much about what has been talked about much but I think that in this particular case what has not been talked about at all is what is going to have greatest potential. My belief is that his knowledge of the impossibility of the official account of the thigh wound is significant in the spectro/NAA suit and otherwise and with any attention, should I later seek it, can make a difference. My present and presently only interest is the court record and what it gives judges to face and ponder, depending on the kinds of judges they are. Anyway, you have my memo of 12/71 if you want to go over it and see if you have any suggestions to make for me to go into. With Carrico I think all I'm really interested in is that the bullet hole was above the collar. If I can file that affidavit and one from Perry I think the appeals court may turn on. Best,